

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 4, 7, and 8 are amended. No new matter is added. Claims 1-8 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 7 is objected to relative to the recitation "a computer-readable medium." The basis of the objection is that the specification does not include verbatim the term "computer-readable medium." Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to FIG. 8 which is a "block diagram indicating one example of a hardware configuration of the information processing apparatus according to the embodiment of the present invention" includes memories 802 and 803, HD 805 and FD 807. A person of ordinary skill in the art knows that the memories, HD and FD, are computer-readable media storing data and programs. On page 23, lines 19-20 of the Specification, it is explicitly stated that "The CPU 801 executes a program read from the HD 805 into the RAM 803 [...]." Although "a computer readable medium" is not verbatim included in the Specification, the recitation has a definite meaning in descriptions included in the Specification and thus for a person of ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the objection to be withdrawn.

Claims 4, 7, and 8 are amended herewith to correct informalities.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C § 103

Claims 1-3, 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,007,067 to Azvine et al. (hereinafter "Azvine") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0152045 to Dowling et al. ("Dowling").

Relative to independent claim 1, in the Amendment filed on March 29, 2007, Applicants argue that Azvine and Dowling do not disclose the recited method in view of the three recited parties: the first staff, the second staff and the caller. The current Office Action asserts that the second staff corresponds to the user programming and loading instructions as described in paragraph [143], lines 20-31 of Dowling. However as recited in claim 1, the second staff is not only the person who specifies the response method in advance, but is also the person to whom the telephone call is directed, because as claim 1 also recites "a first staff [...] answers a telephone call from a caller **on behalf of a second staff in charge of the caller.**" Therefore, claim 1 recites not merely different activities, but that the first staff and the second staff clearly are different persons who perform respective, different activities. In Dowling, there is no teaching

or suggestion of a second person (i.e., staff), because the indicated portion of Dowling merely refers to the same user performing a different activity and not to another person who is in charge of the caller as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Azvine and Dowling alone or in combination fail to disclose all the features recited in claim 1, for example, at least "deciding a background color of a window according to a response method specified by the second staff in advance, and indicating how to respond to the telephone call." Thus, claim 1 and claims 2-6 depending from claim 1 patentably distinguish over the cited prior art.

The dependent claims distinguish from prior art by inheriting patentable features from independent claim 1 and by reciting additional patentable features. For example, claim 2 recites "extracting information relating to the **second staff**" and "displaying the information relating to the **second staff** in the window" (emphasis ours).

In item 16 on page 9 in the "Response to Arguments" section of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner contends that "the previous Office Action did not disclose the limitations that take into account a second staff, because no second staff had been claimed in the prior set of claims." However, on page 2 of the outstanding Office Action, the support for the rejection of claim 2 (which now recites a second staff) is identical to the prior Office Action and no further explanation or justification is provided. That is, although the argument that the portion of Azvine (col. 7 lines 42-60) is admitted not to disclose the features of claim 2 in the "Response to Arguments" section, that same portion is cited again, without any additional explanation or support. Similar situations occur relative to claims 3-6. This manner of answering to the Applicants' arguments (i.e., conceding that the arguments are correct but repeating the previous grounds of rejection that now stand rebutted by the arguments of the intervening response) renders the outstanding Office Action defective. Since the Examiner agreed with Applicants' arguments relative to claim 1, that the Examiner must advance new grounds to reject claim 1 OR else, claim 1 should be indicated as allowable.

In view of the above discussion relative to claim 1, independent claim 7 patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art at least by reciting "deciding a background color of a window according to a response method specified by the second staff in advance to be applied when the first staff answers the telephone call from the caller, and indicating how to respond to the telephone call."

Similarly, independent claim 8 patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art, at least by reciting "a background color decider deciding a background color of a window according to a response method specified by the second staff in advance to be applied when the first staff

answers the telephone call from the caller, and indicating how to respond to the telephone call."

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Oct. 11, 2007

By: L.T. Todor
Luminita A. Todor
Registration No. 57,639

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501